

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

March 9, 2004

LB 888

that question to ol' General Patton, he'd let them know that he wants them to just wonder about that. He didn't say, for me to know and you to find out, but something along those lines. So if they just be cool, keep their powder dry, everything will open up and they will know exactly what's going to happen. This first amendment that I'm offering goes to the committee amendment, and I'm offering it so that I can ask a question or two of Senator Hartnett. Senator Hartnett, the way my amendment is drafted, it would strike line 1 and line 14 of the committee amendment because what the committee amendment does in that line is to strike Section 1 from the bill. Now the change that would have occurred in the section that is being stricken is something I'm not exactly sure of. What was there in Section 1 of the green...oh, here it is, on page 2 in line 19, "if such variation does not reduce energy efficiency." What is being discussed in this portion is the adoption by a political subdivision of a provision that is different from the state building code and it's allowed if it does not reduce energy or efficiency.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Hartnett.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Senator Chambers, you're talking about the first line there, strike original Section 1?

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes, and I'm looking now at Section 1 of the green copy of the bill.

SENATOR HARTNETT: Yeah, yeah.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: In line 19, "if such variation does not reduce energy efficiency; or." Why is it felt that that language is not necessary to be retained?

SENATOR HARTNETT: I think the...Senator Chambers.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Yes.

SENATOR HARTNETT: I think the big problem is with the first part of that section on (1) there, that that deals with the building codes.